DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 466 UD 028 220

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission's Response to the Annual Desegregation Review, 1986-87. Part II: Recommendations on Educational Components.
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 68p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Students; Budgets; Compliance (Legal); *Desegregation Litigation; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; *Program Evaluation; Racial Integration; *School Desegregation; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the response of a monitoring commission to a 1986-87 report on the educational components of a court-mandated school desegregation plan in Chicago (Illinois). The Board of Education was required to alleviate the effects of both past and ongoing segregation by providing educational and related programs for predominantly Black and Hispanic American schools. Overall, the report was very well written and a great improvement over the 1985-86 report. The summary of the major litigation of 1986-87 between the board and the Federal Government demonstrates the important issue of funding the desegregation plan. The following educational components are reviewed: (1) general curriculum and instruction; (2) the Chicago Effective Schools Project; (3) programs in racially identifiable schools; (4) student leadership; (5) magnet schools and programs; (6) vocational and technical high schools; (7) special education and testing; (8) dropout prevention; (9) bilingual education; (10) student discipline; (11) staff development; (12) public participation; (13) faculty desegregation and affirmative action; (14) evaluation; and (15) monitoring. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

UD

M·O·N·I·T·O·R·I·N·G
COMMISSION FOR
DESEGREGATION
IMPLEMENTATION

ED336466

RESPONSE TO THE

Annual Desegregation Review, 1986-87

Part II: Recommendations on Educational Components

under the Student Desegregation Plan for
The Chicago Public Schools

MAY 1988

Mary Davidson
Principal Investigator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Carlos Ospina

Dominica Cohen CPS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Donn E. Bailey
Commission Chair

Manford Byrd, Jr.
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

UD 028 120

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Monitoring Commission's Response
to the

ANNUAL DESEGREGATION REVIEW, 1986-87
PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS ON EDUCATIONAL COMPONENTS

Under the Student Desegregation Plan for
The Chicago Public Schools

Prepared under the direction of
Mary Davidson, Principal Investigator
of the Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate
Maxine Duster
Mari C. Fohrman
Carlos Heredia
Gwendolyn Laroche
Henry Martinez
Janice Metzger
Jesse Miller
Uthman Muhammad
Donnell Peterson
George Riddick
Aida Sanchez
Anna Smith
Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary Davidson

Chicago, Illinois

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report is the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's response to the Chicago Public Schools' Annual Desegregation Review, 1986-87, Part II: Recommendations on Educational Components. The Commission was mandated by the 1980 Consent Decree to review the ADRs annually and disseminate publicly.

Numerous individuals participated in the writing and editing of this response. Primary consultant of this effort was Calvin Smith. Other participants included: Consultants, Barb Leebens-Osilaja and Christy Spears; Staff, Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Also, thanks should be given to the Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs for their assistance in this effort.

Dr. Mary Davidson
Principal Investigator
May 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION.....1

II. OVERVIEW.....2

III. EVALUATION OF THE 1986-87 ADR: PART II.....5

IV. STAFF ANALYSES OF SELECTED CONTENT OF THE 1986-87 ADR: PART II.....8

V. CONCLUSION.....62

I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Chicago Public Schools', 1986-87 Annual Desegregation Review: Part II - Recommendations on Educational Components, March 1988 (1986-87 ADR: Part II) is the fifth such document the Board of Education has published since the 1982-83 school year, as required by the January 1982, Comprehensive Student Assignment Plan. These reports are the principal method whereby the Board communicates to the Court and to the public its progress in complying with Part I, Section 2.2 of the September 1980, Consent Decree:

> To alleviate the effects of both past and ongoing segregation, the plan shall provide educational and related programs for black and Hispanic schools remaining segregated.

The Board had outlined more than two hundred recommendations in response to this portion of the Consent Decree. They were adopted in April 1981, as the first part of the Board's desegregation plan entitled, Recommendations on Educational Components.

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation (Commission) has three purposes in mind for this report. It provides the community with: (1) an overview of the content of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II; (2) a capsule evaluation of the report; and (3) staff analyses of content, including reactions to the Board's effort.

II. OVERVIEW

The 1986-87 ADR: Part II is divided into four chapters. The topical content of each is the following:

(1) General introductory material;

(2) Legal, financial, and managerial aspects of desegregation

(3) A review of each Educational Component of the Plan; and

(4) 1986-87 system-wide and program specific priorities.

As it determined in August 1987 in regard to the 1985-86 ADR: Part II, the Commission once more cites the content of Chapter I as helpful to the reader. Again, this Chapter focuses the 1986-87 ADR: Part II from a proper perspective on the Chicago schools' desegregation efforts. The Chapter presents materials in an easily understood way with a fine sense of chronological order. There is no mistaking the purpose of this ADR nor is there room for doubt with regard to the Board of Education's intent for the document.

Chapter II has three subparts: a summary of 1986-87 litigation; financial aspects of desegregation implementation; and coordination and management of desegregation. The litigation summarized, which occurred up to 1986-87 between the Board and the federal government, pertained to the important issue of funding the Consent Decree initiatives. The presentation organizes the major events chronologically and describes the various court decisions aptly.

The second subpart of Chapter II presents financial data in terms of historical budget allocations to the desegregation effort, by sources of funds. It also summarizes funds provided by the federal and local governments. Budget allocations and dollar expenditures for 1985-86 and 1986-87 are presented and compared for the various programs pertaining to the Consent Decree. Budgeted expenditures by ADR school categories are presented for 1985-86 and compared with the budget allocations for 1986-87.

The third subpart of Chapter II provides a narrative description of efforts to manage and coordinate the various aspects of school desegregation in the Chicago Public Schools. It presents the goals and their rationale followed by a listing of twenty sets of priority activities in 1986-87, and the completion status of those activities.

Chapter III discusses efforts by the Chicago Public Schools to meet the requirements set forth in Recommendations on Educational Components. The following educational components are discussed:

- General Curriculum and Instruction
- The Chicago Effective Schools Project
- Programs in Other Racially Identifiable Schools
- Student Leadership
- Magnet Schools and Programs
- Vocational and Technical High Schools
- Special Education and Testing

- Dropout Prevention
- Bilingual Education
- Student Discipline
- Staff Development
- Public Participation
- Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action
- Evaluation
- Monitoring

The narrative follows the pattern similar to that established in the subpart of Chapter II on Coordination and Management of Desegregation. The overall goal of each component is presented with an accompanying rationale, followed by listings of recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan germane to the Educational Component and their completion status. Implementation priorities for action in 1986-87 are presented next, followed by activities performed pursuant to those priorities. Implementation problems encountered during 1986-87 also sometimes are described as are evaluations of activity outcomes. The last section of each component presentation is a listing of implementation priorities for the current school year, 1987-88, with associated goals, activities, and intended evaluation strategies.

Chapter IV contains a recapitulation of all priorities for 1987-88 action which were presented for each of the Educational Components in Chapter III.

III. EVALUATION OF THE 1986-87 ADR: PART II

The Commission recognizes that the Board of Education could not have published this report sooner but believes that the usual August-September release is better. The Commission repeats its assessment that Chapter I is well written; its content is concise, cogent, and communicates the role of this report in the ongoing implementation of the Consent Decree.

Chapter II is much better written than in 1985-86, especially in summarizing the major litigation of 1986-87. The urgency of the issue is clearly portrayed. The subpart on the nature of desegregation funding is also much improved over the 1985-86 ADR: Part II. The types of data presented contribute to a reasonable understanding of desegregation funding in Chicago. A much more complete picture of desegregation expenditures and sources of the funds is reported as are the program foci for expenditures. The portrayed per-pupil costs for the various ADR categories of schools is well received by the Commission.

The final section of Chapter II is still less easy to follow than the former chapter sections but still much improved over 1985-86. The text pertaining to the stated goal of "Coordination and Management of Desegregation" is organized such that there is a much tighter linkage between goals and the activities. There are still a few activities which appear out of place but not nearly as much reader confusion can occur as did in the 1985-86 ADR: Part II.

The 20 implementation priorities for 1986-87 are listed and immediately followed by a "Summary of 1986-87 Activities" associated with each priority. The connections between the activities and the priorities are clearer this year because there is a discussion of their current status. This permits the reader to make the necessary connections. As opposed to the 1985-86 ADR: Part II, all listed 1987-88 priorities appear to be closely related to desegregation. The Commission sees more purpose in the listed activities but wishes that more evaluative data on the impact of these activities were presented.

Chapter III of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II is also much improved over the 1985-86 version. It, however, still presents problems to the persistent reader. It is an archives document in format. Perhaps it needs to be. Each educational recommendation contained in the April 1981 Recommendations on Educational Components for a particular instructional area is reproduced in the text and accompanied by a status code indicating its level of completion and the data, if appropriate, when the recommendation was satisfied.

There is not always sufficient discussion of the "status of completion" of each recommendation contained in Chapter III. There are results-oriented statements which permit the reader to determine whether or not the Board of Education judgement on recommendation-completion is accurate. However, there are still too many instances where the discussion of the status of a particular recommendation does not definitively state whether or not the recommendation has been satisfied, even though it is coded as being "completed." In other cases such recommendations dealing with staff development activities, it is obvious the recommendation can never be

"completed" because there are always new staff to train. Yet, the recommendation is listed as having been "completed" as early as September, 1981. Again, the Commission wishes to state that these judgements are only possible because the Board of Education has achieved much better organization of material in this ADR.

The discussion of what occurred with regard to priority action areas in 1986-87 is again in the view of the Commission, very much improved. Though the listings are often long, there appears to be a very definite attempt to be thorough. There is more often than not ample evaluative discussion, still lacking in impact data, but at least a discussion appears in this ADR. When presented the sub-section "Summary of Other Desegregation Related Activities for 1986-87," is well-done.

This ADR: Part II has achieved solid organization in the sub-section "Implementation Priorities for 1987-88..." Understandable goal statements relevant to desegregation are listed followed by statements of goal-related activities and then by attempts at evaluation statements for each goal-related activity. The Commission applauds this organization of information, though it may question certain goals as being of high priority, there is no doubt of the importance to the Board of Education.

Chapter III of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II has come a very long way from the 1985-86 ADR: Part II in meeting reporting standards needed to encourage support and understanding by the Court and by the public at-large.

IV. STAFF ANALYSIS OF SELECTED CONTENT IN THE 1986-87 ADR: PART II

This section reports information pertaining to each of the Educational Components, as provided in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. It analyzes the reported discussion and data related to the stated 1986-87 priorities for each component and the levels of activities related to them. It also critiques the relationships between 1986-87 and 1987-88 priorities.

Administration and Management of Desegregation: Legal Status - A Summary of 1986-87 Litigation

The litigation summarized begins with the September 1980 Consent Decree between the Board and the federal government and cites each important legal watershed eminating from that Decree. Primary focus is maintained on the important issue of the federal-funding share of the Consent Decree initiatives. This discussion litigation terminates with the August 18, 1986 remand of the Federal District Order of December 23, 1985. This is exactly where the 1985-86 ADR: Part II ended its discussion one year ago. The reader assumes no hearings on the remand have occurred in Judge Charles P. Kocoras's Court. Though the presentation of material is organized, the major events chronologically-ordered and the various court decisions aptly described, the Board should use this section of the ADR to educate the public as to other desegregation-related litigations e.g. Special Education. There should also be a small discussion of why no major movement has occurred in Judge Kocoras's Court.

Administration and Management of Desegregation - Financial Aspects of Desegregation

The second subpart of Chapter II of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II presents financial data in terms of historical budget allocations to the desegregation effort, by sources of the funds. It also summarizes funds provided by the federal and local governments. Budget allocations and dollar expenditures for 1985-86 and 1986-87 are presented and compared to the various programs pertaining to the Consent Decree.

The Commission is impressed with the immense improvement in the content, organization, and overall discussion of content found in this section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. It is a significantly positive departure from formats found in past ADR's: Part II. The detail of data presented in tabular form in the "Budget Analysis 85-87" and "1986-87 Per Pupil Expenditure and Enrollment Percentages by Category" are most informative to the reader. The accompanying discussions also are welcomed additions to this sub-section. The Commission notes that the Board of Education has responded in major part to criticisms made by the Commission regarding this section in its response to the 1985-86 ADR: Part II. The expenditures by a Board-funded project is also a very significant entry in this ADR.

With regard to the financial data presented, the Commission would make the following reactions. It is obvious that the federal government continues to act-out the role of "piker" very well in the Chicago desegregation effort. That the federal government has only provided $44.71 million, or 10.1 percent, of the total of $444.51 million allocated to desegregation since 1980-81 is in the Commission's view insulting. The Commission reiterates that it stands with the Board of Education in its criticism of the federal government in fulfilling the needs of the Consent Decree to which they are a prime signatory.

The Commission continues to believe and once more encourages the Board of Education to indicate the amount of money the State of Illinois reimburses the Chicago Schools for student transportation expenditures. Spending $29 million annually on a necessary service is a sizeable budgetary entry. The degree to which this costs is reduced by reimbursement is also a necessary entry. Public disclosure of this reimbursement could only lessen the criticism that Chicago desegregation is too costly. Levels of transportation reimbursement should be reported by the Board of Education.

The financing of Chicago school desegregation continues to be a priority concern to the Commission, which is vitally interested in the dollar-flow to racially isolated schools and the nature of the educational inputs these dollars purchase for those schools.

The Board of Education reports spending $35,231,835 in 366 racially-isolated schools enrolling 273,295 students in grades 1-12. This converts to an increase of 5.1 percent over the 33 plus million spent in these schools in 1985-86. It is significant to note that the Board of Education reports that these schools enroll 63.37 percent of all students served by desegregation-related activity and also reports that these schools received 68.95 percent of all dollars spent in educational component efforts.

The Commission recognizes the parity. But, the Commission also recognizes that the 45 Magnet Schools enrolling 35,118 students expended $8.8 million in 1986-87. This is a ratio of 8.14 percent of students served to 17.26 percent of dollars expended or more than 2:1. This ratio in racially isolated schools is little more

than 1:1. The Commission does not wish to see the magnet school budget reduced; it does, however, argue for greater equality in the student/dollar ratios cited.

The Commission wishes to end this discussion by indicating that the presentation of finance found in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II is very well done.

Administration and Management of Desegregation - Coordination

The goal of this component continues to reflect a four part mission: (1) Implement the Plan; (2) Coordinate Plan components; (3) Develop desegregation and equity expertise in the system; and (4) Implement ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the entire desegregation effort.

There are 20 implementation priorities listed for action in the 1986-87 school year; two are reported to be completed. This is not surprising in that most management activity is of an on-going nature, especially when the focus for that management is as large and as complex as the Chicago desegregation effort. Thus, the Commission finds nothing negative in the fact that 18 of the 20 listed priorities are classified as being "in-progress" with no anticipated date for completion.

The Commission fully understands and is totally cognizant of the difficulties inherent in the management and coordination of Chicago's desegregtion effort. The

Commission also believes that the Board of Education is striving to attain sound management and control of its desegregation efforts. But, in spite of this, the Commission finds itself asking serious questions regarding the content of this section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II.

The Commission is concerned about a number of items: the evaluation of the Plan as its various components are put into action; the nature of the monitoring of equity issues in the various educational components of the Plan; and, the degree to which the goals and objectives of the Plan are indeed the goals and objectives of the Chicago Public Schools: all its schools, all its administrative units, all its employees.

The Board of Education discusses many actions it has taken in these areas: hiring 23 district-based desegregation implementation coordinators and 23 desegregation assistance clerks, providing up-graded levels of central office support to field units and schools, securing of outside funds to assist with many desegregation-related events, and enduring coordination of the various units involved in fulfilling the goals of the Plan.

The Commission asks if there is any evidence that any of this activity has resulted in movement of the system toward the stated goals of this component. At one point in this ADR sub-section it is reported that "(DEEOP) fully complied with all requests for information from the...Monitoring Commission...." The Commission has evidence that would somewhat refute this statement, especially when DEEOP must garner data and information from other administrative units. Simple questions arise from Commission deliberation of this ADR sub-section.

- Who monitors action plans of schools and administrative units to determine if they reflect the goals and objectives of the Plan?
- Who determines the lasting effects of staff development activity on Board of Education staff?
- Who assesses policy to determine its equity issues and/or impact?
- Where is the evaluation strategy for the Plan and in the same vein where is the monitoring design for the Plan?
- Where is the evidence that desegregation sub-district coordinators and clerks are having the desired impact?
- Last, and probably of highest significance to the Commission, where are the definitive studies to demonstrate that students attending racially-isolated schools are better-off today than they were in 1980-81?

These are questions of moment that the Commission believes the 1987-88 ADR: Part II should answer. It does not.

Before leaving this section it should be noted again that there has been improved management and coordination in the flow and maintenance of fiscal data and certain student data. DEEOP is primarily responsible for these improvements. There is also a freer flow of communication between the Commission, DEEOP, and other administrative units. The goal now is for more productive interaction to occur.

Curriculum and Instruction

The overall goal of this component can be stated in three parts:

- Provide curricular and instructional materials that are free from cultural bias and reflect a multicultural perspective; and
- Ensure that curriculum is equally accessible and consistent systemwide; and
- Establish achievement of high academic standards as the priority objective for all schools and students.

The 1986-87 ADR: Part II reports on these goals by organizing the discussion of the requisite recommendations under the rubric of administrative units: elementary schools, ESEA and Title I, newly desegregated schools, staff development, and high schools. The reader should be mindful that the recommendations being discussed are those which first appeared in the April 1981 Recommendations on Educational Components.

Curriculum and Instruction: Elementary Schools - Systemwide

Eight recommendations are listed and all are reported to have been completed in 1981 or 1983. None is reportedly unmet. The "status" discussions provided are clear and specific; the detail reported is also highly germane to the recommendations listed. The Commission would like to have seen a statement or two regarding the impact of these efforts on the goals for this component. Perhaps such evaluative statements could be provided in future ADR's: Part II.

Curriculum and Instruction: Newly Desegregated Schools

There is a single recommendation listed under this topic. The reader is given references to other areas of the ADR for a discussion of efforts made to satisfy its content. This report will discuss those efforts when the referenced areas, Staff Development, Racially Isolated Schools, and Chicago Effective Schools are reviewed.

Curriculum and Instruction: ESEA and State Title I

There are three recommendations listed. None have yet to be addressed. There is no "status" discussion presented to explain why this has not occurred. The Commission would ask why no such explanation is presented and would further ask why no activities are planned for these recommendations in 1987-88.

Curriculum and Instruction: Staff Development

Two recommendations are listed and neither has as yet been addressed by the school system. No explanation is provided to explain this lack of attention. The Commission asks why no "status" discussion is presented and why no actions are planned for 1987-88. This seems especially critical for recommendation #2 which calls for "improved faculty evaluation and accountability" mechanisms with a report due-date of December 1, 1981.

Curriculum and Instruction: High Schools - Systemwide

Nine recommendations drawn from the Student Desegregation Plan are listed under this topic. This section is especially weak in terms of the "status" discussions presented. In most cases the information presented gives the reader no clue, hint, or glimmer as to whether or not the Chicago School System is close to satisfying the appropriate recommendation. In some instances, notably recommendation #7, the "status" narrative is nothing more than a statement of leadership philosophy one would find in a textbook on the role and responsibilities of a beginning principal.

In the case of recommendation #6, reportedly completed in August 1981, the "status" discussion never even mentions whether or not the effective schools inservice to be provided to high school teachers, occurred on the intended topics. There is also no statement as to how many teachers participated. It is also curious that this recommendation was satisfied in 1981 and nothing has been done since. It would appear, at least, to the Commission that, 1) new high school teachers do not need the training or 2) the training has been judged to be not worth giving.

Curriculum and Instruction: Status of 1986-87 System-wide Implementation Priorities

Four major priorities are listed in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II, along with numerous activities. Most priorities are coded as having been satisfied during the 1986-87 school year. From the information presented, the Commission concurs with these judgements. When a priority is listed as incomplete or not yet addressed, more than adequate information is presented as to why and additional information is presented regarding future plans for completing the priority.

Curriculum and Instruction: System-wide Priorities for 1987-88

The reader is somewhat invited by this sub-section of the ADR to compare listed goals with the recommendations first presented in the beginning of the section on Curriculum and Instruction. Such a comparison should reveal whether or not there is proper focus on priorities of moment. The Commission does not quarrel with the four goals listed for 1987-88 action. They should be addressed and it appears that they will receive more than adequate attention. The Commission is heartened that the one Implementation Priority for 1986-87 which went unaddressed is once more included for attention in 1987-88.

But, the Commission is concerned that many recommendations for this educational component which have not been addressed to this point, e.g. Staff Development and ESEA and State Title I, will go unaddressed for another year. Recommendations thus far under-addressed, will receive no additional attention. Why?

Curriculum and Instruction: Elementary Schools - The Chicago Effective Schools Project

The goal of this project has been widely published and is reproduced below from page 82 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II.

> The Chicago Effective Schools Project was designed to remedy the impact of racial isolation on minority student achievement, through implementation of instructional and organizational strategies to ensure that all students acquire basic skills. The program seeks to help schools improve in six major factor areas: leadership; instructional emphasis; school climate; staff development; assessment of student progress; and parental involvement and support. A primary goal is to achieve school/classroom improvement through a process of needs identification and local action planning.

The Board of Education is utilizing the CESP effort to address three recommendations in the Student Desegregation Plan. These recommendations are discussed in this sub-section of the ADR. The Board of Education indicates that the first recommendation was "completed" in the 1981-83 time frame. This completion occurred with the selection of a maximum feasible number of racially isolated schools to receive a strong instructional intervention strategy. These schools are, of course, the 105 schools commonly referenced for this project. The ADR document lists these schools in Appendix I.

The Board of Education classifies the remaining two recommendations in this area as "in-progress" with an on-going timeline for completion. These recommendations reference the strong instructional intervention strategy the 105 selected schools are receiving. The status discussion which follows contains a school-year by school-year account of the actions taken by the Board of Education in the 105 target

schools. It is an excellent account of what was done in terms of actions taken. But, there is not one statement as to the impact of these actions, not one. Nowhere is there a statement of the impact of all this activity on the effectiveness of the schools involved in the project, especially as effectiveness is defined in the goal for this project. The Commission once more asks why no such information is presented?

Curriculum and Instruction: The Chicago Effective Schools Project - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

The Board of Education goes on to discuss eleven Chicago Effective Schools Project (CESP) priorities established for the 1986-87 school year. All priorities are listed as "in progress" with an on-going timeline for completion. The Board of Education then presents a discussion of what occurred in 1986-87 to move toward completion of the identified priority issues. Again, much activity is described, all highly relevant to the listed priority issues. But, where are the statements of impact? There are other troublesome statements in this area of discussion.

Five schools were reported to have been provided with "quality circle" inservice. Who attended? In another section it is reported that the staff of 10 schools were provided with five CESP inservices. Only attendance percentages for principals and teacher facilitators are provided. Were they the only staff which attended? In a third area, inservice was to be provided to new staff at CESP schools. Once more only principals and teacher facilitators are referenced as participants. Were they the only new staff in CESP schools requiring such inservice?

Curriculum and Instruction: Chicago Effective Schools Project - Priorities for 1987-88

The Board of Education lists two goals for priority consideration regarding CESP for the 1987-88 school year. They are accompanied by eleven major activities with each activity being coupled with a statement of evaluation intent. That which is listed is a necessary activity in the view of the Commission. The Commission is somewhat perplexed, however, that there is no activity listed which would lead to an evaluation of the impact of CESP on school staffs, students, parents, or communities. The Commission wonders if such an effort will ever occur.

Curriculum and Instruction: Elementary Schools - Other Racially Identifiable Schools

The Department of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs lists the following goal on page 102 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II as the synthesis goal for this Educational Component.

> The Desegregation Plan for the Chicago Public Schools requires the elimination of disparities that adversely affect black and Hispanic students enrolled in schools remaining racially segregated.

This goal has been the hallmark of activity for many instructional programs through the years. The most notable of these has been the Chicago Effective Schools Program including the expenditure of the $20 million in Yates funds received from the federal government for the 1983-84 school year.

There are two recommendations listed in this ADR sub-section which are germane to this goal and that flow from Recommendations on Educational Components. These recommendations are classified as having been completed, one in 1981 regarding the establishment of Board Policy and one in 1982 regarding the establishment of an Instructional Improvement Team to assess the needs of these schools. The Commission understands that the latter of these recommendations has been satisfied, but is also aware that the student's needs in these schools have not been satisfied.

Additionally, the Commission notes that the final "status" remark in this ADR sub-section references the Board of Education's intent to spend the entire Settlement Fund of $83 million in up-grading these schools. This is ample evidence of the unmet needs still remaining in these schools.

Curriculum and Instruction: Other Racially Identifiable Schools - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

Five priorities are listed as having received major attention during the 1986-87 school year. The first is categorized as "in progress" with an anticipated completion in 1988. The remaining four are listed as having been "completed" between June and August 1987. The Commission believes that none have been completed and that all are "on-going" in terms of when they will be completed. The nature of these priorities is continuing and no true completion date can be set in the near term. The anticipated Settlement Fund program will operate for a five-year period and will impact these five priorities for at least that term if not longer.

Curriculum and Instruction: Other Racially Identifiable Schools - Priorities for 1987-88

Four goals are listed for 1987-88 attainment in this ADR sub-section. They belie the continuing nature of the priorities discussed in the preceding paragraph. The Commission finds no fault with these goals or that they should have a certain level of priority. The Commission prefers at this point to focus its resolve on the beneficial impact of the Settlement Fund program, Creating A New Approach To Learning (CANAL), rather than on discussing the relative merits of the goals listed in this ADR sub-section.

Curriculum and Instruction: High Schools - High School Program

There is a single goal for this Educational Component which has been synthesized from the Board-adopted Recommendations on Educational Components. This goal is reproduced below as it is stated on page 108 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II.

> To develop and implement curricular and instructional procedures which are designed and administered in a manner such that all racial and ethnic groups may benefit from the educational experience by:
>
> - providing curricular and instructional materials that are free from cultural bias and which reflect a multicultural perspective.
> - ensuring that curriculum is equally accessible and consistent systemwide.
> - establishing achievement of high academic standards as the priority objective for all schools and students.

Nine Board-adopted recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan are addressed by this Educational Component. Seven of these nine recommendations are classified as "in progress" with regard to their completion status. One recommendation dealing with the assessment of instructional materials for evidence of racial bias is classified as being "completed" in 1983 and one recommendation, regarding the assessment of the appropriateness, accuracy, and usefulness of the high school criterion-referenced pupil progress evaluation system, has been classified as "not yet addressed." None of the "in progress" grouping of recommendations has any anticipated completion dates listed in the ADR.

First, the Commission will quickly note that these are reported plans to assess the high school criterion-referenced pupil progress evaluation system. The Commission also notes that this activity is not among 1987-88 priorities and does not find attention to it per se in the discussion of 1987-88 priorities for the Evaluation Educational Component.

The Commission would like to see attention given to this area of school system activity as soon as possible.

Second, the Commission is concerned that the one high school program recommendation listed as being completed may not be. The status discussion of this particular goal-area does not indicate in a clear-cut, no-nonsense fashion whether or not all high school instructional materials have been assessed for evidence of cultural bias. There is an indication that principals were instructed via a bulletin what to do and that high schools were provided with guidelines and instructions for detecting bias; but, nowhere does it say all 65 high schools fully implemented the guidelines, completely followed instructions or conformed to the transmitted bulletin. Why?

Third, the Commission is not convinced that the recommendation dealing with the conduct of a comparative analysis of high school curricular offerings has yet been meaningfully addressed. The status discussion associated with this recommendation is not to-the-point and leaves the reader in bewilderment as to what has been done to complete this Board-adopted recommendation.

Fourth, there is another recommendation which states in part, "examine the general school climate to ensure it reflects commitment to desegregation..." The status discussion for this recommendation contains no content which speaks to an examination process. Instead it relates that the principal of each school is charged with this matter and is responsible for the level of commitment of school climate to desegregation. The Commission does not doubt this concept. What the Commission wishes to give the public is an assurance that in following their charge principals do conduct the required examination and further conduct it according to well-articulated criteria, using uniformly understood procedures, in a standardized reporting format. If indeed, meeting the intent of this recommendations is so profunctory why was it necessary for the Board of Education to adopt for inclusion in the Student Desegregation Plan?

Last, the Commission would note that the remaining recommendations in this ADR sub-section are not addressed in a sufficient fashion by their discussion summaries. Too much must be taken on faith and too little evidence is given to suggest serious efforts are being taken to accomplish the intent of these recommendations.

Curriculum and Instruction: High School Programs - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

There are three programmatic initiatives addressed in this sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II: 1) Language Arts and Mathematics Learning Centers; 2) Basic Academic Skills for Job Placement Centers; and 3) In-school Suspension Learning Centers. These programs are the full responsibility of the Office of the Field

Assistant Superintendent. Each program had but one implementation priority for the 1986-87 school year. This ADR sub-section is not convincing.

The reader is told that a great deal of activity took place but is given no notion of impact or results of impact. There is no mention of how many students were served by the various centers. No mention of any indices of academic growth, incidence of job placement, nor behavior improvement. Where is the evidence that these centers have any value for their participants? It needs to be summarized here and detailed in attached appendices.

Curriculum and Instruction: High School Programs - Priorities for 1987-88

There are eleven priority actions listed in this ADR sub-section. They are listed under four goal areas. Five of the eleven deal with fully establishing Westinghouse Preparatory Technical High School and appear to be appropriate to this goal. This program is included in the recent Board approved Settlement Fund Proposal (CANAL) and should go forward with quickened pace.

The remaining six activities are oriented toward three priority goals covering six programs including: Staff Development Equity of Access to Educational Programs, the High School Directory and the high school centers dealing with, language arts and mathematics, basic skills and job placement, and in-school guidance and tutoring. These priorities appear to be in order and are of interest to the Commission. The nature of the intended evaluations are on-target. This gives the Commission hope that the next ADR: Part II will contain improved discussions of high school programs than the current ADR: Part II contains.

Curriculum and Instruction: High Schools - Student Leadership Development

This effort is a special project currently operating in forty-five high schools. The goals for the project are extensive and are reproduced below from page 126 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II:

- Implement a pilot/demonstration program in selected schools that will involve identified students in a comprehensive peer-leadership development training process. The program will enhance their ability to provide positive role models and leadership to other students in the school;
- Develop in individual students a sense of self-esteem with a view toward increasing their academic and personal growth;
- Develop school pride by providing situations that will enable students to work cooperatively on projects to benefit the entire school;
- Develop, within each of the schools, a forum through which student concerns, suggestions, and other input can be heard;
- Develop and implement pilot programs focusing on parent-initiated intervention strategies at selected schools. The programs will increase the time in school for students who are considered to be at risk of experiencing significant educational failure; and
- Develop student and parent handbooks which clearly defines the goals and policies of each of the schools behavorial expectations for students and staff, the regulations and penalties contained in the Uniform Discipline Code, and related information.

This student leadership effort is used by the Board of Education to address three recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan. The current status of these recommendations is coded as "in-progress", however; no anticipated dates for completion are listed, not even the "on-going" phrase found elsewhere. The status discussion provided for these three recommendations is non-informative. There is a statement that student leadership groups were formed in each school. There is no

mention of when, how often they met, or if they set or achieved any objectives. There is a paragraph indicating that administrators of the schools were invited to a help session with an external consultant. There is no mention of how many administrators attended or if they developed any plans of worth or if they did anything in their schools as a result of the inservice.

The Commission is hopeful that more data and information as appendixed information on the Student Leadership Program was also only intent-oriented with no impact data provided.

Curriculum and Instruction: High School Student Leadership - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

The Board of Education lists five 1986-87 priorities for this Educational Component. Two are coded as being "completed" in June 1987. Three are coded as being "in-progress." Again, no completion dates are offered. The priorities listed are obviously aimed at all students in the forty-four high schools which are a part of this program.

In the summary discussion associated with these five priorities, a statement of intended activity for the Student Leadership Program is made by the Board of Education. In part it states that participating students in the program are to:

1. Assist staff and administrators at orientations for new students;
2. Conduct discussion groups in freshman divisions and act as helpers to students needing assistance; and

3. Visit feeder elementary schools to:

   a. assist with recruiting,

   b. encourage elementary students to stay in school,

   c. and, assist elementary students to prepare for high school.

The Commission finds no operational relationship of significance or meaning between this statement and the five priorities it is supposed to support and document. Neither does the Commission find any data in the listed activities to indicate that any of the afore-listed priority goals for student leadership were activated. The Commission asks how many new-student orientations received student assistance; how many discussion groups were held in freshmen divisions; how many students needing assistance received peer help and what types of helping roles were played; and how many feeder elementary schools were visited?

The Commission also would ask why there appears to be no focus or activity on the 1986-87 priority regarding "increase[ing] parental involvement in planning programs related [to] the problems of at-risk students." Did anything happen in this vital area? If it did, why is it not reported?

This sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II is most up-setting. There appears to be a great measure of mis-focus by the Board of Education. The Commission finds practically no common thread at all in the statements provided. Goals are written as if recommendations do not exist; priority actions only tangentially recognize goal content, and activities which are supposed to support priority actions do not reflect or even seemingly avoid indicating progress made toward priority completion.

Curriculum and Instruction: High School Student Leadership - Priorities for 1987-88

The Board of Education lists three goals for 1987-88 action and the Commission finds no fault with any of them. However, the Commission finds serious fault with the omissions in this goal listing.

Three priorities for 1986-87 were coded as being "in-progress" which is another way of saying "not yet finished." Only one of these unmet 1986-87 goals is listed among the priorities for 1987-88; a statement dealing with the initiation of efforts to allow students to work cooperatively on school-wide projects. The remaining two incomplete 1986-87 priorities go unmentioned in the 1987-88 priority list. Why? If they are incomplete, not yet finished, when are they to be addressed, 1988-89?

This is just one more example of the poor manner in which this sub-section of the 1987-88 ADR: Part II is written. This sub-section needs more administrative attention when it is written. The Student Leadership Program itself is perhaps being poorly administered. Whichever, the Commission suggests corrective action.

Magnet Schools and Programs

In contrast to the annual ADR: Part I where specifics with regard to enrollments, curriculum, instruction, and expansion are discussed, the ADR: Part II discusses only the management of this Educational Component. The goal of this component is widely quoted and is reproduced below from page 131 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II.

> To establish a series of programmatic options that will:
>
> - Provide educational choices for parents and students desiring an alternative to the program offered at the local school;
> - Enhance desegregation by attracting students from across the city to racially integrated schools, or programs within schools, based on their particular interests, needs, or special talents; and
> - Provide an opportunity to develop educational, instructional, and organizational models that can be replicated at other school sites.

The Board of Education then lists and discusses the status of a number of recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan which are highly relevant to this particular Educational Component. The history of the development of the Magnet Schools and Programs Component is traced from the establishing of design quidelines to the creation of the latest programs. This area of discussion is well organized and well written. The Commission finds this to be a straight-forward presentation which is easily understood.

Magnet Schools and Programs - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

The Board of Education lists and discusses actions taken in support of six 1986-87 priority goals. The priorities are germane to the required recommendations taken from the Student Desegregation Plan. The summary discussions provided are also on-target. The status of each priority is well-documented. Better estimates of certain completion dates could be provided, however. It does not seem appropriate to use "on-going" as a completion date for a finite activity such as pre-lottery screening for applicants.

Magnet Schools and Programs - Priorities for 1987-88

Five goals, all consistent with previous statements of direction and purpose, are outlined in this ADR sub-section. Appropriate milestone activities and general statements of evaluation intent accompany each goal. The Commission concurs with all goals presented.

The Commission questions why there is no goal statement regarding the on-going, unresolved issue of over-crowded schools, especially those involving large Hispanic enrollments. Certainly, the Board of Education will continue to address this concern. The Commission asks why there is no translation in this ADR of this concern into administrative action-steps. Those steps should be detailed in this sub-section. Perhaps, this is just a simple oversight.

The Commission signals this omission as the only shortcoming in an otherwise well-written sub-section.

Vocational and Technical High Schools

Three separate educational thrusts are discussed in this section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II: Maximizing Training Level Opportunities, Community Resource Data Bank for Career Education, and the Bureau of Vocational Support Services. The reported goals, page 146 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II, for this Educational Component are:

- To ensure that vocational and technical education opportunities are equitably designed, implemented, and managed;
- To expand and improve our programs to meet current and projected job entry requirements and provide additional vocational/technical education opportunities for minority students;
- To upgrade staff teaching skills required for rapidly changing technologies; and
- To continue the acquisition of equipment and upgrading the facilities for vocational and technical programs.

Seven Recommendations on Educational Components are presented in this sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II and each is thoroughly discussed. Six of the seven are categorized as "in progress" of being completed and one is presented as "completed." The Commission quarrels with this last judgement. The recommendation calls for the development of strategies to desegregate 95-percent, black-vocational high schools. No such strategy exists as the Board of Education admits in the "status discussion" of this recommendation. If the recommendation remains unsatisfied, how, the Commission asks, can it be categorized as "complete?"

Despite this argument, the Commission finds the "status discussions" presented in this sub-section to be most thorough and highly informative.

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Maximizing Training Level Opportunities - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

There are eight priorities listed for 1986-87. The attending summary discussions are somewhat sketchy but even at this level of detail they are to-the-point and informative. Five priorities are listed as being "completed" and three are categorized as "not yet addressed." The latter three all cite a lack of funds as the prime reason for lack of movement. The Commission would like some discussion from the Board of Education regarding efforts to find the necessary funds to initiate these priorities.

The Commission finds only one area of contention in this sub-section. One priority listed as "completed" was to "monitor all school districts to ensure that students are enrolled in career/vocational programs." The "status discussion" relates that elementary districts 3, 15, 16, and 17 were monitored during 1986-87. Four is not all. The Commission challenges whether this priority has been "completed."

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Maximizing Training Level Opportunities - Priorities for 1987-88

Seven goals are listed for priority action this school year. The Commission is pleased to see that the three 1986-87 priorities classified as "not yet addressed"

are being re-scheduled for 1987-88 and is further pleased to find that each activity statement includes actively seeking additional funding. The Commission also is pleased to see the goal related to the recruitment of non-public school students into vocational and technical high schools.

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Community Resource Programs - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

Five uncompleted priorities are discussed in this sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. The summary statements provided, communicate and also provide a limited level of impact data. The Commission concurs with all statements and judgements made by the Board of Education in this sub-section.

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Community Resource Programs - Priorities for 1987-88

Five goals, all of which are germane to the desegregation responsibilities of this administrative unit, are presented and discussed. The Commission awaits the results of listed evaluation efforts. The program efforts described appear to have promise for elementary-age children and school staff. The Commission wonders what actions will be taken to secure additional community partnerships and what is planned to maintain those effective partnerships secured during 1986-87. Where positive, productive relationships exist they should be supported in every way possible.

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Vocational Support Services - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

No less than 35 priorities are listed and discussed in this sub-section. They are sub-headed under five program components: 1) Vocational Assessment; 2) Handicapped; 3) Articulation; 4) Limited-English Proficient; and 5) Student Services Corporation. The Commission finds this sub-section to be well written with a comparatively high level of numerical detail presented to substantiate the "completion" of many of the listed priorities. The Commission hopes that as much progress can be made in 1987-88 as was made in 1986-87 in this Educational Component.

Vocational and Technical High Schools: Vocational Support Services - Priorities for 1987-88

There is but one goal listed by this Educational Component for 1987-88 action. But, it represents a sizeable effort. Increasing access and participation of disadvantaged, handicapped, and limited-English proficient students in vocational education classes is a goal in which the Commission takes great interest. It speaks to the heart of the issue of providing increased educational opportunities to historically underserved groups of students. The Commission will want to be informed of the evaluative results of this significant programmatic effort.

Special Education and Testing

The sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II is organized into separate discussions of three Educational Components: 1) EMH Assessment/Validation; 2) the EMH Transition Program; and 3) Dropout Prevention Efforts. No overall goal for Special Education and Testing is either presented and, of course, not discussed.

Special Education and Testing - EMH Assessment/Validation

There are four goals which are germane to this area. They are reproduced here from page 172 of the ADR:

- To reassess students in special education programs using a scale of adaptive behavior or another standardized instrument with independently validated local norms;
- To discontinue the use of standard individual tests of intelligence as the sole source of information in special education screening and evaluation;
- To move immediately toward the use of criterion-referenced, rather than norm-referenced tests; and
- To provide appropriate staff development to effectively implement these recommendations.

Eighteen recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan are discussed by the Board of Education as they relate to the above goals. The 1986-87 ADR: Part II thoroughly addresses each of the recommendations. Where recommendations are cited as being "completed", the Commission concurs and where they are categorized as "in progress" the Commission finds sufficient discussion to warrant such a judgement.

There is but one point on which the Commission seeks clarification. The singular recommendation in the area of staff development is categorized as having been completed in 1983-84. Hopefully, all new personnel who have contact with handicapped students also are required to participate in the cited staff development program. The Commission will ask for further details on this concern in the near term.

Special Education and Testing: EMH Assessment/Validation - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

Seven priority areas are listed as having been addressed in 1986-87. Without undue comment, the Commission notes that the Bureau of Child Study overuses the phrase "this...will be initiated upon receipt of system endorsement and necessary resources," when describing why a certain implementation priority was not completed. In fact, it is used in the discussion section of four of the seven priorities.

The Commission does not understand how a priority initiative listed in a Board of Education-approved document (the 1985-86 ADR: Part II) as a response to a Board of Education-approved recommendation in the Student Desegregation Plan needs further endorsement. The Commission also does not understand how a Bureau can list an initiative as having priority status if it has no budget to commence activity. Who is kidding whom? The Commission is most curious as to the meaning of the word "priority" to this Educational Component.

Special Education and Testing: EMH Assessment/Validation - Priorities for 1987-88

Seven goals are listed for 1987-88. The Commission urges that all receive the attention indicated, especially with regard to the field-testing of the Spanish version of PAL. The activities listed cite attempting to procure system endorsement and resources for many goal statements. The Commission is highly interested in the results of those attempts and wants to know now how they are progressing.

Special Education and Testing: Transition Program

The Student Desegregation Plan does not reference this Educational Component. It rose as a need in response to the 2,000 former EMH students which the reassessment process indicated requiring general educational placement. The Commission not only understands this need but applauds the intent of this Educational Component. The Commission also understands that the recommendations contained in this sub-section have no source in the Student Desegregtion Plan but stem from Board of Education desires to fully communicate efforts in this area.

Six recommendations are listed and the status of each discussed. The Commission concurs that all were "completed" in 1987 with two exceptions. Recommendations five and six speak to the acquisition of ancillary personnel needed to fully support Transition efforts. The status discussion of these two recommendations indicates tnat the optimal mix of personnel, especially social workers, does not exist. The Commission does not believe these two recommendations can be categorized other than "in progress" until personnel requirements are more fully satisfied.

Special Education and Testing: Transition Program - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

This is one of the most informative sub-sections in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. The level of discussion achieved and the numerical data provided should serve as a model to other administrative units as they prepare their portion of the 1987-88 ADR: Part II. The Commission certainly wishes more of this ADR were written in this style.

There are eight 1986-87 priorities discussed. The Commission fully believes these efforts were of priority and believes they were treated as such; a priority. Transition Program goals for 1986-87 were met.

Special Education and Testing: Transition Program - Priorities for 1987-88

Six goals are listed and discussed. The Commission notes that the major priorities in place during 1986-87 are once more to be addressed in 1987-88. The Commission concurs with these judgements and awaits the results of the indicated evaluations.

Special Education and Testing: Dropout Prevention

The goal here is simple enough, "increase the number of students graduating from Chicago Public high schools." Two recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan are presented as relevant to this goal. Both are categorized as "in-progress" having not yet been "completed."

The Commission notes that an appropriate computer-based system that accounts for student withdrawals is greatly needed. While this is the first step, the Commission notes that the system lacks operating personnel to provide the appropriate paper-flow to the computer. These personnel, it appears, are still not available.

The Commission is mindful of the need for data. But, also is not so much interested in counting dropouts as it is with preventing them. A computer-based counting system will not reduce a dropout rate. Programs are needed.

Special Education and Testing: Dropout Prevention - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

After reading this sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II the Commission has come to rather harsh conclusions. Four priorities are presented and glibly discussed. Two of the four are listed as "completed" because requests for personnel to fully activate the computer-based data system were requested. No matter that no personnel were provided; at least, there is no indication they were provided.

The remaining two priorities deal with programs administered by the Bureau of Dropout Prevention which have the goal of retrieving and reducing dropouts. The discussion for these two priorities is best described as numbingly insignificant. What JPTA programs are referenced? How many students did each serve? How many participants were former dropouts? How many participants graduated? These questions go unanswered for the reported JPTA programs and the cited Hospital and Health Care Program as well.

To the reader of this sub-section, it is no small wonder the Chicago Schools have a dropout problem. There is no reliable way to count them, no program in place to identify them in early grades, no detail on how many are being enticed back into school, no information on the number of potential dropouts being retained through graduation, and seemingly no desire to provide a public discussion on any of these short-comings.

Special Education and Testing: Dropout Prevention - Priorities for 1987-88

Four goals are presented and discussed. The Commission notes that there will once more be an effort to create a reliable data-base on dropouts. Hopefully, it will occur this time around. Two goals deal with programs for students. These programs go un-named and it must be assumed that student groups identified for participation are dropouts or highly likely to be. The Commission is not impressed by this discussion.

Bilingual Education

The overall goal of the Bilingual Educational Component is summarized as follows on page 201 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II

> To plan, facilitate, and provide a core and supplementary educational programs which are equitable and appropriate for the variety of national origin minority students in the Chicago Public Schools.

This goal is given direction by twenty-two recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan. These recommendations are organized under seven highly correlated topics: 1) curriculum; 2) evaluation; 3) monitoring; 4) staffing; 5) staff development; 6) movement of students; and 7) parent involvement. This discussion will approach each area in turn.

The curriculum recommendations are all related to the listed goal. But the discussion provided as to the status of the five listed recommendations leaves gaps in reader comprehension. All five recommendations are categorized as having been "completed" in June 1987. The narrative support for this judgement is totally lacking in two instances.

Recommendation one states, "provide the same goals and objectives for both regular English proficient and limited-English-proficient students." The status discussion states, in part, "The Office of Instruction Services has issued policy statements requiring [the recommended action]. Well, "requiring" is not the same as "providing." The Commission must ask the provision question.

Recommendation five states, "provide equitable funding for the purchase of native language and TESL materials." The provided status discussion states that "schools have been instructed to provide [the materials]..." Additionally, state support provides supplemental funds for purchase of these materials. The Commission sees two problems here. Is the funding equitable? There is no discussion of this. Are schools following their instructions in their purchases? No information is provided.

There are five recommendations listed under evaluation and the Commission does not quarrel with the discussion of the first three or the last. Under recommendation four which speaks to the conduct of a longitudinal study of the impact of bilingual programs, the status discussion refers to an annual longitudinal study performed by the Department of Research and Evaluation (DRE). The Commission finds the phrase "annual longitudinal study" curious and will file a request for copies of the last three DRE reports on this matter.

Recommendations listed under monitoring are of no problem to the Commission in two of three instances. But, recommendation two speaks to "implementing" certain monitoring actions and the status discussion references a set of monitoring procedures which at the time of this report had yet to be disseminated. There is no correlation between an "intent to implement" and the meaning of "implement" when the recommendation is categorized as "completed" in June 1987. The Commission doubts this judgement of completion status.

The Commission concurs with the narrative provided for the recommendations listed under staffing and staff development. It reaffirms its position that the Board of Education must continue to give both of these efforts persistent attention.

The five recommendations listed under movement of students drive at the heart of a great deal of Commission concern in bilingual education. Those recommendations speak to access to programs and activities within schools but also to access to Options for Knowledge programming. The Commission sees many obstacles to LEP students participation in magnet schools and magnet programs. It is no small task to eradicate these barriers. The Commission would like to be able to determine if the Board of Education is moving to identify these barriers and to eventually remove them from the educational lives of LEP students.

The sole recommendation under parent involvement stirs the Commission to heightened response. This discussion is a micro example of the perception the school system has of parent involvement in schools. They see parents as units; units with needs which call-out to be treated. They see parents as targets of communication. They seemingly fail to recognize that parents also have solutions to problems and can become initiators of sound communication as well as receivers. The Commission does not feel the current ADR: Part II discussion of parent involvement in bilingual education is appropriate or even valued.

Bilingual Education - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

No less than twenty-five priority actions are reported in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II as being initiated last school year. The Commission finds all priorities to be relevant to the overall goal of this Educational Component and very much in-keeping with recommendations for which this Component is responsible. There is a great deal of uneven reporting when the status of each priority action is discussed but the Commission chooses to focus on the positive nature with the intent of program

improvement. The Commission is anxious to see the success of the options programs for LEP students which were completed in August 1987. Other programs also have attracted Commission interest and will be monitored. Last, the Commission still regrets the position on parental involvement taken by this Component.

Bilingual Education - Priorities for 1987-88

This sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II lists seven major activities as having priority in 1987-88. The Commission has no concern regarding the first six priorities. But, it once more lodges a serious concern with the content of the parent involvement activity. It continues the philosophy that parents are objects to be treated not as partners to be greeted.

Student Discipline

The goal of this Educational Component remains very straight-forward. It is reproduced below from page 215 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II.

> To develop and implement an equitable, consistent, and nondiscriminatory systemwide uniform code of student conduct that:
>
> - Codifies unacceptable student behavior and penalties;
> - Applies to all schools, yet is flexible;
> - Is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations;
> - Approaches discipline from a holistic and preventive philosophy;
> - Is readily available to all staff, students, and parents;
> - Emphasizes alternatives to suspension as a form of punishment;
> - Can be effectively monitored and evaluated; and
> - Can be conveyed to administrators, faculty, and students.

Recommendations contained in the Student Desegregation Plan are listed under three topics for discussion in this ADR. These discussion topics are: 1) The Uniform Code of Student Conduct; 2) Disciplinary Practices and Procedures; and 3) Inservice for Administrators, Faculty and Students. There are nineteen recommendations addressed in this sub-section.

There is no doubt the school system has moved beyond establishing and disseminating a code of student conduct. The status discussion of the six recommendations contained under this topic are ample evidence of this movement. The Commission is also convinced that the inservice required of this Educational Component is, at least, occurring.

But, the Commission still has concerns that it stated in regard to the 1985-86 ADR: Part II with regard to Disciplinary Practice and Procedures and will discuss them at another point in this narrative.

Student Discipline - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

The priorities listed were dealt with in a positive fashion and the Commission concurs that all were "completed."

Student Discipline - Priorities for 1987-88

The Commission is pleased to see the re-listing of the eight-part goal that has guided the priority activities for this Educational Component through the years. The Commission at this point reiterates concerns it has with information regarding Discipline Practice and Procedures.

The Commission requests for a second year that the following two evaluative studies be performed by the Board of Education:

> Is the Uniform Discipline Code equitably administered in each Chicago Public School with an integrated/desegregated status, with a tri-ethnic racial mix, and with full-site magnet status?; and
>
> Is the Uniform Discipline Code nondiscriminatory in practice on a systemwide basis?

The Commission is pleased to recognize that the following Commission-initiated questions were dealt with in 1986-87.

> To what degree have alternatives to suspension been used as forms of punishment and what has been the effect of these alternatives on the total number of suspension issued in the past two years: 1984-85, 1985-86, and the latest year 1986-87?
>
> Is the Uniform Discipline Code being effectively monitored and evaluated and what evidence exists to support the finding, whichever it is?

This 1986-87 ADR: Part II contains the data and information which more than substantiates Board of Education responses to these issues. The data contained in the Appendices to this ADR also is evidence of these actions.

Staff Development

The goal of this Educational Component was expressed on page 226 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II as follows:

> To establish preservice and inservice programs which will:
>
> - Ensure that Desegregation Plan requirements are understood and personal and collective anxieties associated with the desegregation process are allayed;
> - Make provisions for special intervention and support for schools attended by students who have been most disadvantaged;
> - Assist staff in developing skills, understanding, and attitudes to enable them to enhance academic achievement for all students; and
> - Enhance competencies of staff so they can provide more effective services to students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds.

This goal is articulated in terms of fourteen recommendations from the Student Desegregation Plan. These recommendations are catalogued under a general heading in this ADR. There are also six additional headings, each representing another Educational Component, requiring assistance from staff development services. These six specific headings are: 1) Curriculum and Instruction - Elementary Schools; 2) Curriculum and Instruction - High Schools; 3) Magnet Schools; 4) Special Educatir and Testing; 5) Bilingual Education; and 6) Student Discipline.

This is a well-written section. The status discussions which accompany each listed recommendation are substantive in nature and communicate a fine sense of purposive activity. The Commission concurs with all judgements made with regard to the completion status of each recommendation. There is one disturbing element, however.

In nearly all status discussions there is a recommendation that future inservice activity be transferred to an administrative unit other than the Bureau of Staff Development. There is a constant theme that the "functional leadership and direction" for a given inservice area be moved to another administrative unit.

The Commission does not and should not quarrel with this. It has the singular desire that quality inservice occur in a timely fashion. It cannot concern itself with who does it. But, the Commission is troubled as to why these "transfer" statements are made at this time and in such a profuse fashion. An explanation will be sought.

Staff Development - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

Thirteen staff development priorities were attended to during the 1986-87 school year. The Commission has no questions or concerns regarding either the priority of the statements or the results listed to document the completion of each priority. This sub-section is soundly written in a well organized fashion and includes sufficient detail, in nearly all cases, which communicate a results-oriented program. The Commission perceives that much inservice occurred but would like

to have seen some level of evaluation results of this activity included in this narrative, if not here, then at least in an appendix or two.

Staff Development - Priorities for 1987-88

Nine priority actions are listed for this school year. In the view of the Commission none speak directly to the desegregation process and few if any speak to the recommendations contained in the Student Desegregation Plan. The Commission needs to know where these "abandoned" activities will be placed in the school system administration. Surely staff development in Magnet Schools will not cease, nor will it cease in Bilingual. But inservice recommendations related to staff development are not found in the content for those Educational Components in the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. The Commission is concerned that responsibility for vital inservice functions is not being properly fixed by this public document. The Commission believes this is vital and should be corrected forthwith.

Public Participation

The 1986-87 ADR: Part II expresses the goal of this Educational Component on page 243 as follows:

> To maximize the involvement of all segments of the Chicago community, including parents, in the development, implementation, and evaluation of desegregation and related initiatives by:
>
> - Developing and maintaining various citizen advisory panels to ensure two-way communication and access by citizens to important policy and program issues associated with the Desegregation Plan.
> - Establishing mechanisms for sharing and exchanging school community resources in a manner helpful to the desegregation process.
> - Developing strategies and programs to improve public relations and the image of the schools.
> - Developing strategies, including use of non-English language media, for improving information dissemination about all aspects of the desegregation process, to parents and the community.
> - Establishing mechanisms for acquiring the services, expertise, and commitment of Chicago business organizations to improve basic academic skills of students and to demonstrate the relationship of these skills to the world of work.

This goal is embellished in this ADR in terms of four recommendations taken from the Student Desegregation Plan. All recommendations are classified as being "in progress" in terms of their completion status. They are also listed as being "on-going" in nature.

The detail provided as documentation for the completion status definitely confirms the label "in progress." No activity is reported after 1984-85 with regard to the maintenance of the Desegregation Advisory Panels formed by the Chicago Board of Education in January 1981. There is no mention of the current operational status of either of the committees. If they no longer exist, this ADR does not reveal such. There is documentation provided with regard to the initiation of a Parent Education center (a move the Commission strongly endorsed), but the detail presented does not correlate well with the three recommendations it is supposed to witness. Much more information is needed to permit the reader to determine the actual completion status of these three recommendations.

Public Participation - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

Five public participation priorities were first listed in the 1985-86 ADR: Part II to receive first-attention during the 1986-87 school year. Two dealing with assisting Local School Improvement Councils, one focusing on providing assistance to Desegregation Implementation Co-ordinates with parent involvement, and a fourth priority related to the establishment of the Parent Education Center are all classified as being completed. The Commission concurs that these priorities were satisfied as defined.

A fifth priority dealing with the involvement of citywide and community organizations in an on-going basis with regard to the status of desegregation is a priority categorized as "in progress" and "on-going" in nature. Activity did occur in 1986-87; activity should always occur in this area. With the initiation of the results of the Education Summit even more activity will be required.

Public Participation - Priorities for 1987-88

One goal is listed for priority attention during 1987-88, expanding the services of the Parent Education Center. This is a settled issue for years to come given the activity set forth for this Center in the CANAL project and with the latency for action contained in the results of the Education Summit. There have been and will be many "town-meetings" and much for the Parent Education Center to do beyond the scope of these community activities.

The Commission is forced to caution the Chicago Board of Education not to allow the goals of the Education Components to become submerged in shared governance and local school councils. These latter concepts must give buoyancy to the various aspects of Student Desegregation Plan. This focus needs to be clearly communicated to all involved. Recent events are not an excuse to pause.

Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action

The often stated goal of this Educational Component is stated on page 251 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II and remains:

> To assure that the composition of personnel in the Chicago Public Schools reflects an appropriate range of racial ethnic, and cultural experiences and background by:
>
> - Making every good faith effort to integrate the faculties in the Chicago Public Schools so that the racial/ethnic composition in each school will be within 15 percent (moving toward ± 10 percent) of the system-wide averages for each type of school facility;
> - Correcting any underrepresentation of minorities found to exist within the work force of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago; and
> - Developing and implementing a comprehensive affirmative action program addressing all areas of employment and all personnel practices with timetables for attainment of stated goals.

Five recommendations are listed, all are categorized as "in progress" and no target-dates for completion are provided. There is movement toward getting each school faculty within a ten percent range of the systemwide faculty composition. In 1986-87 it reflected a range of 11.5 percent. But with regard to the documentation detailed for the remaining four recommendations for this Educational Component, little if any progress is notable.

The status discussion associated with these recommendations reveals that the Chicago Board of Education has appointed an Administrator-Personnel Affirmative Action and Contract Compliance administrators effective December 1, 1987. The Commission favors these appointments and has called for such in the past. But, the Commission is also quick to ask what the Administrator-Personnel slot will fulfill?

The Chicago Board of Education has yet to adopt the affirmative action plan placed before it in 1983-84. Likewise there is little evidence presented in this ADR that much has occurred in other areas outlined as part of the Consent Decree process. The Commission remains concerned.

Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

There were six priorities listed for attention during the 1986-87 school year. All dealt with the placement of teachers, including various categories of substitutes, and with the recruitment of teachers consistent with system affirmative action needs. The Commission is satisfied that efforts were made to adhere to the goals of the Student Desegregation Plan. It is also satisfied that significant recruiting efforts were launched. A little more detail on the results of the various recruiting efforts would be helpful to the reader at this point. Such results should be included in future ADR: Part II's.

Faculty Desegregation and Affirmative Action - Priorities for 1987-88

Two goals are listed: 1) reduce the range of faculty composition to an eleven percent range of systemwide averages and 2) establish the Bureau of Affirmative Action to report directly to the General Superintendent of Schools. The Commission concurs with both priorities. It is mindful that the latter priority calls for the creation, implementation, auditing, and monitoring of an Affirmative Action Plan. There is no provision for Chicago Board of Education authorization of this plan. The Commission asks, is this an omission or an intention?

The Commission posed many questions in its reponse to the 1985-86 ADR: Part II regarding affirmative action. None were answered in this or any other section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. The Commission poses them once more.

1) How many certified staff took advantage of the Voluntary Transfer Program to Enhance Integration at the elementary and high school levels respectively in each of these school years, 1984-85, 1985-86, and in 1986-87?

2) How many programs and generally what types of programs were able to be continued because minority staff were assigned to predominantly minority schools?

3) What is the degree of minority day-to-day teacher assignment in magnet schools, Chicago Effective Schools, Level II schools, predominantly Hispanic schools and respectively? and

4) How many teachers with special qualifications (see item 3 under Section F on page 192 of the 1985-86 ADR: Part II) were encouraged to make appropriate application to "further enhance or maintain integration? How many did so apply? How many were placed such that integration was enhanced or maintained?

Evaluation

The goal for this Educational Component is synthesized from the nature of the individual Recommendations on Educational Components. This goal appears on page 258 of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II as follows.

> To develop a comprehensive formative and summative evaluation strategy and process which will provide a verification data base for reporting to the court and the general public on the status of implementation of desegregation initiatives and the impact of the Plan's implementation in the areas of student assignment and improved educational quality and equity.

This goal is reflected in one global recommendation which is easily interpreted as a self-initiated administrative charge to the Department of Research and Evaluation. This charge is straight-forward, develop a model of evaluation including detailed procedures and steps to be taken to ensure that all the efforts described in the Recommendations on Educational Components are, indeed, evaluated. This singular recommendation is categorized as being "in progress" with no "anticipated state of completion" reported.

The evidence presented to document the completion status of this recommendation is all centered on the 1985-86 school year, though this ADR is designed to report on the 1986-87 school year. This is, however, not as consequential to the Commission as is the lack of relevance of the "status" discussion to the content of the presented recommendation. The recommendation statement references the production of an all-inclusive model for evaluating all the elements found in the Recommendations on Educational Components. The Commission senses that this model should be finished by

now and that it should be presented in the "status" discussion of this ADR sub-section. Repeating 1985-86 accomplishments is not what is required. If the model is done, present it. If it is not completed, explain where the design process is complete and what remains to be done.

Evaluation - Status of 1986-87 Implementation Priorities

There are 22 statements of priority activity contained in this sub-section of the 1986-87 ADR: Part II. Each deals with a major problem area well within the purview of the Student Assignment Plan. The agenda of 22 priorities is reported as having a mixed completion status. Four priorities are reported as being "in progress" and eight priorities are reported as being "not yet addressed." Thus, it appears as if only 46 percent of the 1986-87 evaluation agenda was completed prior to the beginning of the current school year. Based on an analysis of documentation provided in this sub-section of the ADR, this completion rate is lower than reported by the Department of Evaluation and Research.

Priority #22, regarding conducting special studies in Racially Identifiable Schools, is listed as having been completed in April 1987. However, it is also listed as having been cancelled due to a need for additional funding. The Commission also questions whether or not priority seven, regarding the evaluation of the 1986-87 Paideia Program, was truly completed in September 1987. The reported status discussion would lead one to conclude this priority was not completed. Thus, the 1986-87 priority agenda of the Department of Evaluation and Research may have only been 36 percent accomplished. This is too meager a record in terms of what was promised in response to the Recommendations on Educational Components and in terms of listed priorities for 1986-87.

Evaluation - Priorities for 1987-88

There are four goals listed as priorities for Department of Evaluation and Research activity during the 1987-88 school year. The Commission finds each to be warranted and hereby gives early notice of its active interest in the results of the intended evaluation of the Chicago Effective Schools Program.

V. CONCLUSION

The Chicago Public Schools 1986-87 Annual Desegregation Review: Part II: Recommendations on Educational Components has been reviewed by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation. The Commission finds the report to be clearly written for the most part and far less tedious in format than the 1985-86 ADR: Part II. The length of Volume I is also less of a problem. Volumes II and III, which are appendices to Volume I, included considerable information that assist the reader in gaining a complete understanding of the latter content. The Commission has raised issues and concerns which the Board of Education and the school system administration might wish to address. Other issues will be raised as they become appropriate via direct memoranda to the school system administration.